

had been grossly extravagant, that there was danger of trouble ahead, that there was danger of depression, that there was danger of our extravagance producing its natural and legitimate results, and that it was time to take precautions—why, Sir, just as I was abused for doing that in 1873-74, so was I abused in 1878, because I refused then to be dismayed, because, under very peculiar circumstances, the finances of this country were less prosperous than the country could wish. Events in both cases justify my hon. friend and myself. A depression which we told the people must come, did come, and the revival which we told them would come, whether they chose to eject the late Government from power or not, did come. The difference was this, that the revival was not wisely used; that revival and the prosperity that accompanied it were made the excuse for boundless and monstrous extravagance; for improperly entering into many obligations, which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, and which the Minister of Finance has not attempted to deny. The hon. Minister did not dispute a single fact or a single figure advanced by the hon. member for North Norfolk. A greater compliment could hardly have been paid him, unless indeed it was the groans which were extracted from the other side of the House by every paragraph of the hon. gentleman's Resolution. I am afraid it is an unfortunate fact, whether the hon. Minister chooses to admit it or not, that there is an undercurrent of political unrest in this country. I tell the hon. gentleman that men, perhaps not in this House, perhaps not on a political platform, but men all through this country, are looking to the future with alarm and uncertainty; and I, for one, dread sincerely the results of the monstrous additions which the hon. Minister has made, and is constantly making, as the mouth-piece of the Government, to the indebtedness of this country and to the annual expenditure. The fact of the matter is that, just as they acted before, the Government are staking their future, and staking for some years to come the future of the country, on a mere chance. If things go well, if we happen to have good harvests, if good prices are received for those harvests, if trade revives in the United States, if trade is good in England—if the whole chances go in the hon. gentleman's favour, then it is possible, by good luck and not by good management, we may obtain a good deal of relief from the position which otherwise I dread we shall occupy. But the truth is this, that at the present moment, notably in their dealings with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the people of Canada have been taking a leap in the dark, and neither in this House nor out of it is any man justified in saying that the future is reassuring, or that there are not very good reasons for serious apprehension as to the future financial position of this country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not intend to delay the House more than a moment or two, as I rise simply for the purpose of referring to the comparisons which hon. gentlemen opposite have made. As the hon. Finance Minister has pointed out, there can be no possible objections to comparisons being made between Canada and the United States, provided they are fairly made; but when they are made in a manner calculated to mislead those who may read the speeches of hon. gentlemen, and those who are desiring to settle in this country, I think they are mischievous, and ought, if possible, to be promptly corrected. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), stated that the expenditure of the United States was about \$265,000,000. That is quite true; but as the hon. Finance Minister pointed out, the hon. gentleman did not mention State taxation, to which we have nothing analogous in this country. I find the aggregate State debts in the United States amount to \$267,762,075, and I find the annual taxation, that is, the regular direct taxation for State purposes—and I do not

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

include that for municipal purposes—reaches \$61,434,095. That is a tax, as I say, to which we have nothing analogous in this country. But that is not the only feature in which the comparison made by the hon. gentleman is hardly a fair one. We have in this country expenditures by the Federal Government which are not made by the United States Government. We find, for instance, that the Dominion Government make large expenditures on harbours and rivers, whereas in the United States those improvements are made by the State and not by the general Government. To the expenditures on the harbours of Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York, the States contributed very largely, for which they receive no tonnage dues, they have given the improvements as a free gift to the commerce of the country. In addition to that, we have large expenditures made by the Federal Government in other ways in this country to which there is nothing analogous on the other side of the line; and we may fairly say that, looking at the position of the two countries in regard to those expenditures, any attempt to prove that this country is in a very inferior position, with regard to the taxation of the people, is one which cannot be successfully maintained, if the statements are fairly and reasonably made. When we come to find that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), in order to maintain the comparison made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, actually compared the expenditure on pensions with subsidies to Provinces, I think we may fairly say that hon. gentlemen opposite must be driven to their wits-end to find some means of making comparisons which will prove injurious to the interests of this country. The amount of \$60,000,000 spent for pensions goes into the pockets of the pensioners. The subsidies go into the treasuries of the Local Governments, and are expended by them for purposes for which, in the United States, the respective States have to resort to direct taxation. So we may fairly say that an attempt to make a comparison between the expenditures on pensions and the subsidies to the Provinces shows how unfair is the impression which will be conveyed by the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has undertaken to compare this country with the old countries of Europe, as if there were any analogy between the two cases. Canada is a young country; we are developing its resources; we are building it up; we have an enormous territory and a comparatively small population; and in the nature of things, we have to incur large expenditures in order to accomplish that development. A fair comparison would be, not with the old countries of Europe, but with the Australian colonies, which are at this moment in fact, competitors with this country for the emigration of Great Britain especially. And what do I find with respect to those colonies? That Australasia, which includes the group of colonies, has an aggregate public debt of \$479,827,910, and the annual expenditure reaches \$95,709,230. Remember these colonies are doing exactly what we are doing. They are young countries, developing their resources; they are seeking to make the countries suitable for the homes of people who may come from the old world. On coming to deal with particular colonies, I find these results. New South Wales has a population of 817,464. Its annual expenditure is £6,347,810 sterling, or in round figures, about \$32,000,000. That small colony of 817,000 people has an expenditure greater than that of the entire Dominion. New Zealand, with a population of 563,800, has an annual expenditure of £3,824,735 sterling, or in round figures, very nearly \$20,000,000—more than \$19,000,000 at any rate. Then in Queensland, which has a population of 248,255, the annual expenditure is very nearly \$10,000,000. In South Australia, with a population of 293,509, the annual expenditure is about \$10,500,000. In Tasmania, with a population of 122,479, the annual ex-